

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-35, 37-38, and 40-46 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 9, 17, 23, 31, 35, and 38 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 9, 17, 23, 31, 35, 38, and 40 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully request that the amendments be entered as they are merely presenting the rejected claims in better form for allowance or consideration on appeal should the Examiner maintain the rejection.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Examiner Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview conducted on September 9, 2009, with Applicants' representatives: Mr. David C. Isaacson and Mr. Bruce B. Vance. Proposed amendments to claims 1, 9, 17, 23, 31, 35, and 38 were discussed that are believed to overcome the applied references. The substance of the interview is incorporated in the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Applicants have amended claims 35 and 38 to overcome the objections thereto set forth in paragraph 3 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner

reconsider and withdraw the objections to claims 35 and 38 set forth in paragraph 3 of the Office Action.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Paragraph 11 of the Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 7-12, 15-20, 23-26, 29-41, 43, and 45-46¹ under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,430,674 to Trivedi (“Trivedi”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,405,303 to Miller *et al.* (“Miller”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants maintain that the Examiner’s interpretation in the Office Action of the claim term “recoder” is impermissibly broad. However, in order to further prosecution, Applicants have amended the claims as follows:

Claim 1 recites, in part, (emphasis added):

a first recoder *to map an instruction from one instruction format to another instruction format*; and
a second recoder *to map an instruction from one instruction format to another instruction format*, the second recoder coupled to the first recoder[.]

Claim 9 recites, in part, (emphasis added):

a first recoder *to map an instruction from one instruction format to another instruction format*; and
a second recoder *to map an instruction from one instruction format to another instruction format*, the second recoder coupled to the first recoder[.]

Claim 17 recites, in part, (emphasis added):

a first recoder *to map an instruction from one instruction format to another instruction format* that generates at least one

¹ Applicants note that this rejection should not include claims 36 and 39 as they have been previously canceled. As such, Applicants will not address claims 36 and 39 in their response.

information bit based on an expand instruction belonging to a first instruction set architecture; and
a second recoder *that recodes an expandable instruction belonging to the first instruction set architecture* using the at least one information bit generated *to form a recoded instruction belonging to a second instruction set architecture*[.]

Claim 23 recites, in part, (emphasis added):

a first recoder *to map an instruction from one instruction format to another instruction format*; and
a second recoder *to map an instruction from one instruction format to another instruction format*, the second recoder coupled to the first recoder[.]

Claim 31 recites, in part, (emphasis added):

(b) dispatching the expand instruction *to a first recoder configured to map an instruction from one instruction format to another instruction format* and the expandable instruction *to a second recoder configured to map an instruction from one instruction format to another instruction format*[.]

Claim 35 recites, in part, (emphasis added):

dispatching the first instruction *to a first recoder that maps an instruction from one instruction format to another instruction format* and the second instruction *to a second recoder that maps an instruction from one instruction format to another instruction format*[.]

Claim 38 recites, in part, (emphasis added):

a plurality of recoders that operate in parallel, each recoder *mapping an instruction from one instruction format to another instruction format*[.]

As discussed in the Examiner Interview on September 9, 2009, Applicants respectfully submit that Trivedi does not teach or suggest a first and a second recoder to map an instruction from one instruction format to another instruction format. Applicants respectfully submit Miller does not overcome the deficiencies of Trivedi. In light of the

interview, Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been traversed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 9, 17, 23, 31, 35, and 38.

Claims 2-4, 7-8, and 41 are dependent on independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2-4, 7-8, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) set forth in paragraph 11 of the Office Action.

Claims 10-12, 15-16, and 43 are dependent on independent claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 10-12, 15-16, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) set forth in paragraph 11 of the Office Action.

Claims 18-20 are dependent on independent claim 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) set forth in paragraph 11 of the Office Action.

Claims 24-26, 29-30, and 45-46 are dependent on independent claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 24-26, 29-30, and 45-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) set forth in paragraph 11 of the Office Action.

Claims 32-34 are dependent on independent claim 31. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) set forth in paragraph 11 of the Office Action.

Claim 37 is dependent on independent claim 35. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) set forth in paragraph 11 of the Office Action.

Claim 40 is dependent on independent claim 38. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) set forth in paragraph 11 of the Office Action.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1-4, 7-12, 15-20, 23-26, 29-35, 37-38, 40-41, 43, and 45-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) set forth in paragraph 11 of the Office Action.

Paragraph 52 of the Office Action rejects claims 5-6, 13-14, 21-22, 27-28, 42, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Trivedi in view of Miller, and in further view of Common Art. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 5-6, 13-14, 21-22, 27-28, 42, and 44 are dependent ultimately from independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 23 respectively and since neither Trivedi nor Miller, whether taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of the independent claims 1, 9, 17, 23, 31, 35, and 38, they also does not teach or suggest all of the elements of dependent claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 21, 22, 27, 28, 42, and 44. Applicants respectfully submit the Common Art does not overcome the deficiencies of the combination of Trivedi in view of Miller.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections be removed from claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 21, 22, 27, 28, 42, and 44 and that these claims be allowed.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



David C. Isaacson
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,500

Date: September 10, 2009

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

1004737_1.DOC